CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:

U-All Creek Ranch Inc Stock Well

Proposed

Implementation Date: 2022

Proponent: U-All Creek Ranch
Location: T11N-R43E-Sec 11

County: Rosebud

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The surface lessee U-All Creek Ranch Inc wishes to drill a well on the above mentioned tract of State Trust Land and has filed the appropriate improvement form. The purpose of this well is to provide a more reliable water source for livestock on this section.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

The proponent has requested that the DNRC allow the drilling of a stock water well and placement of a stock water tank and has filed a DS-405 improvement form detailing expenditures. DNRC staff has evaluated this site, and due to the small scope and nature of this request, no public comment was sought. The Montana Sage Grouse Habitat Conservation Program was not consulted as this activity is exempt under EO 10-2014 and EO 12-2015.

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

DRNC - Water Resources Division

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative A: Approve improvement form for water development on state land

Alternative B: No action

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

Alternative A: The presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils was not noted in the area of development. Due to the small scope and footprint of the project no significant impact is expected.

Alternative B: No Impact

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

Alternative A: A Class I (literature review) level review was conducted by the DNRC staff archaeologist for the area of potential effect (APE). This entailed inspection of project maps, DNRC's sites/site leads database, land use records, General Land Office Survey Plats, and control cards. The Class I search results revealed that no cultural or paleontological resources have been identified in the APE.

Because the topographic setting and geology suggest a low to moderate likelihood of the presence of cultural or paleontologic resources, proposed activities are expected to have *No Effect* to *Antiquities*. No additional archaeological investigative work will be conducted in response to this proposed development. However, if previously unknown cultural or paleontological materials are identified during project related activities, all work will cease until a professional assessment of such resources can be made.

Alternative B: No Impact

11. AESTHETICS:

Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

Alternative A: No Significant Impact

Alternative B: No Impact

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

Alternative A: No Significant Impact

Alternative B: No Impact

13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:

List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

Alternative A: No Impact

Alternative B: No Impact

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.
 - Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

Alternative A: No Significant Impact

Alternative B: No Impact

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

Alternative A: No Impact

Alternative B: No Impact

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

Alternative A: No Impact

Alternative B: No Impact

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

Alternative A: No Impact

Alternative B: No Impact

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:

Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

Alternative A: This stock well is part of the lessee's plan to use this parcel for pasture as the need arises. After the well is installed and the acreage is fenced in, the lessee will be billed for 73 AUMs derived from non-crop acreage on a yearly basis. Additionally, the project will provide a reliable water source for livestock and wildlife in the area and should aid in grazing distribution and benefit the resource.

Alternative B: No Impact

EA Checklist Prepared By:

Name:

Seth Urick

Title:

Land Use Specialist

Date: 06-01-2022

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Alternative A

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

The granting of the requested stock water well development on this tract of state owned trust lands for the purpose of improving grazing distribution and wildlife habitat should not result in nor cause significant environmental impacts. The proposed action satisfies the trusts fiduciary mandate and ensures the long term productivity of the land. An environmental assessment checklist is the appropriate level of analysis for the proposed action